

**1**

## 2

3

4

5

O

7

$$\begin{array}{c} ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \end{array}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{pmatrix}$$

9

4

5

16

8

1 January 23, 2001. By letter dated March 19, 2001, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's  
2 position was properly allocated.

3  
4 On April 18, 2001, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's determination with the  
5 Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

6  
7 Appellant works in the Water Quality Section of ECY. He performs the duties of a staff  
8 environmentalist for agricultural related water quality projects in the Eastern Region. Appellant is  
9 the primary regional contact person and section specialist for agricultural related water quality  
10 issues and projects. Appellant's duties and responsibilities include evaluating and providing  
11 technical assistance for water quality improvement and protection issues, managing non-point grant  
12 and loan agreements, and acting as liaison with outside entities including the federal government,  
13 state agencies and other governmental organizations.

14  
15 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that the Director's designee placed too  
16 much weight on his prior CQ and contends that the CQ applicable to this appeal designates him as  
17 the section specialist with section-wide responsibility in the areas of irrigation and the dry land  
18 program. Appellant argues that the agency uses the terms "specialist" and "expert" interchangeably  
19 and contends that his CQ, which was written by management, provides written designation that he  
20 is the watershed agricultural expert in the region. Appellant asserts that the nature of his work and  
21 the projects which he is assigned are high priorities and critical to the department. In addition,  
22 Appellant asserts that he serves as the regional expert on various committees and boards. Appellant  
23 argues that he works on issues and critical projects that have regional and statewide significance,  
24 that he functions as the section specialist/expert, and that his position should be reallocated to  
25 Environmental Specialist 5 (ES5) classification.

1 In the alternative, Appellant argues that his position should be reallocated to the Environmental  
2 Planner 3 (EP3) classification. Appellant contends that the EP3 classification encompasses the  
3 scope of duties he performs but does not require written designation as an expert.

4  
5 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that the Director's determination is  
6 well reasoned and should be affirmed. Respondent further argues that there is no evidence the  
7 Director's designee relied upon Appellant's old CQ in deciding this appeal. Respondent contends  
8 that Appellant is asking the Board to exceed its authority and to rewrite the specification for the  
9 ES5 classification. Respondent asserts that Appellant performs important work but that he does not  
10 perform the higher-level work or have the written designation necessary to be allocated to the ES5  
11 classification. Respondent further asserts that the terms specialist and expert, as used in the ES  
12 class specifications, are not interchangeable for purposes of allocation. Respondent contends that  
13 Appellant does not function as a section expert and his position is properly allocated to the ES3  
14 classification.

15  
16 In regard to the EP3 classification, Respondent asserts that the planning function does not constitute  
17 a majority of Appellant's duties. Respondent contends that planners create policy and review plans  
18 while specialists actually carry out the work. Therefore, Respondent argues that Appellant's  
19 position best fits within the specialist classification series, and specifically, the ES3 classification.

20  
21 **Relevant Classifications.** Environmental Planner 3, class code 67420; Environmental Specialist 3,  
22 class code 62970; and Environmental Specialist 5, class code 62990.

23  
24 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
25 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
26 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that

1 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
2 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
3 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
4 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
5 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

6  
7 The definition of the Environmental Specialist 3 classification describes positions that  
8 independently act as staff environmental specialists for an area or specific site and perform  
9 compliance and enforcement duties; develop, perform, coordinate, implement and evaluate  
10 scientific analyses, plan or serve office or field projects; gather and analyze information to develop  
11 recommendations and make decisions; and develop, review and oversee permit functions.  
12 Appellant's duties are described by this classification, however, his scope of regional expertise goes  
13 beyond the level encompassed by the ES3.

14  
15 The definition of the Environmental Specialist 5 classification requires that incumbents be  
16 designated in writing as a senior program experts in a program subject area, have responsibility for  
17 sensitive, complex activities critical to the agency and with regional, statewide or national interest.  
18 Consistent with our decisions in Griffith v. Dep't of Ecology, PAB Case No. ALLO-00-0016 (2000)  
19 and Stash v. Dep't of Ecology, PAB Case No. ALLO-00-0001 (1999), when a classification  
20 specification requires written designation, we must look for a document that confers such a  
21 designation upon the position in question. This written documentation can be a formal agency  
22 designation form, an approved CQ or other written documentation. In this case, we find no  
23 evidence to support Appellant's claim that the agency uses the terms specialist and expert  
24 interchangeably. Furthermore, we find no document that confers written designation as a program  
25 subject expert to Appellant's position. Therefore, allocation of Appellant's position to the ES5  
26 classification is not appropriate.

1  
2 The definition for Environmental Planner 3 states: "[s]erves as an independent project manager  
3 responsible for guiding the development of environmental resource plans, programs, policies or  
4 regulations." Appellant functions as a project manager for the region's agricultural related water  
5 quality issues, he independently evaluates and coordinates activities and acts as the primary  
6 regional contact for issues in his area of responsibility. Appellant's position meets the definition of  
7 the EP3 classification.

8  
9 The distinguishing characteristics for Environmental Planner 3 state:

10       The associate planner level provides expertise and consultation to staff of various  
11       environmental programs; or provides planning or policy development assistance to  
12       staff from other state agencies, levels of government, or concerned organizations.

13 Appellant's position provides assistance and guidance to other state agencies and levels of  
14 government; therefore, his position meets the distinguishing characteristics for the EP3  
15 classification.

16  
17 Because Appellant lacks written designation as the regional expert for agricultural related water  
18 quality issues, the scope of duties and level of independence assigned to his position are best  
19 described by the EP3 classification. The determination of the Director should be reversed.

20  
21 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be granted and his position should be  
22 reallocated to the EP3 classification. The determination of the Director, dated March 19, 2001,  
23 should be reversed.

24  
25  
26 **ORDER**

Personnel Appeals Board  
2828 Capitol Boulevard  
Olympia, Washington 98504

1 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is  
2 granted, the determination of the Director, dated March 19, 2001, is reversed, and Appellant's  
3 position is reallocated to the Environmental Planner 3 classification.

4  
5 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

6  
7 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

8  
9 \_\_\_\_\_  
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

10  
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

12  
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
Personnel Appeals Board  
2828 Capitol Boulevard  
Olympia, Washington 98504